

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION V

DATE: MAR 21 1985

SUBJECT: MPCA Amendment to Cooperative Agreement for the Reilly Tar Project

FROM: Paul Bitter, RPM *OB*  
Illinois/Indiana Unit

TO: Cynthia Wakat  
Program Support Section

US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5



515922

This memo summarizes discussions I had with (separately) Michael Harris, CH<sub>2</sub>M-Hill, Steven Riner, MPCA, and you on March 20, 1985.

Due to the inadequacy of the Reilly proposed design for granular activated carbon treatment at St. Louis Park, Minnesota, and due to the inability of Reilly to finish design and commence with construction as conveyed to me by Robert Leininger, RC, we are recommending approval of the state of Minnesota's cooperative agreement for the design and construction of a GAC System for St. Louis Park. I have requested that Michael Harris update the costs for the system that CH<sub>2</sub>M-Hill proposed in 1983. These costs should be utilized in the amount of design and construction funds awarded in the cooperative agreement. Furthermore, we should consider the cost-effectiveness of the calgon design used by Reilly in their submittals. Although the design is incomplete, we should have the state's contractor evaluate the design, its shortcomings, and prepare a corrected conceptual design that is equivalent, in detail, to the CH<sub>2</sub>M-Hill proposed design. Thereafter, the state's contractor can recommend the better design and the MPCA/EPA can review and approve a satisfactory design.

Thus, I recommend that a condition be stipulated in the cooperative agreement that requires the state's contractor to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of a finished calgon GAC design compared to the design proposed by CH<sub>2</sub>M-Hill in their 1983 report. Funds to finish the calgon design to make it comparable to the CH<sub>2</sub>M-Hill design should be included in the award. I have asked Michael Harris to provide that estimate, by March 21 to me.

After the award is made, the contractor will have the funds to make the comparison and the Regulatory Agencies can decide which design to construct. In any case, the full cooperative agreement based on updated costs should be awarded.

cc: R. Leininger, 5C  
G. Kulma, 5HR-16  
J. Dikinis, 5HR-16